

R E M A R K S

The office action of May 1, 2006 has been reviewed and its contents carefully noted. The Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the careful review and thoughtful comments made in said office action. Reconsideration of this case, as amended, is requested.

Support for these amendments can be found in the application as originally filed, e.g., in the specification and claims.

Claims 5 and 11 remain in this case.

Claims 5 and 11 are currently amended as independent claims.

Claims 13 - 16 are new dependent claims which depend on independent Claim 5.

Claims 17 - 20 are new dependent claims which depend on independent Claim 11.

Claims 1 - 4, 6 - 10, and 12 are canceled.

Applicant submits that no new search is required based upon the present amendment, and that the timely allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Examiner stated that claims 1, 6, 7, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foster, U.S. Patent 6,052,134. Additionally, the Examiner opines that Foster does not specifically state that the data stored in the memory is image data. In response, the Applicant has canceled claims 1, 6, 7, and 12.

Moreover, the Examiner stated that claims 1 - 3, 6 - 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stracovsky et al., U.S. Patent 6,286,075 in view of Foster, U.S. Patent 6,052,134. Furthermore, the Examiner opines that Stracovsky et al does not specifically state that the data stored in the memory is image data. In regard to claims 4 and 10, the Examiner opines that Stracovsky et al and Foster failed to disclose positioning adjacent lines of the image data in separate memory banks to optimize access to multiple lines of data. In response, the Applicant has canceled claims 1 - 3, 6 - 9, and 12.

ALLOWABLE CLAIMS (CLAIMS 5 AND 11)

The Examiner found claims 5 and 11 objectionable, because they are dependent upon a rejected base claim. In response the Applicant has amended claims 5 and 11 to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant has rewritten canceled claims 2 - 4 and 6 as new dependent claims 13 - 16 which depend on amended independent claim 5. Moreover, the Applicant has rewritten canceled claims 9 - 10 and 12 as new dependent claims 17 - 20 which depend on amended independent claim 11.

Therefore, amended independent claims 5 and 11 are believed to be patentable. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim objections are respectfully requested.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Dependent claims are dependent upon the respective independent claim which are traversed Supra, by virtue of their dependency, as well as the additional elements they respectively contain, are deemed patentable.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection and rejection are respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

Applicant believes no new search is needed by the Examiner. Applicant further believes the claims, as amended, are patentable over the prior art, and that this case is now in condition for allowance of all claims therein. Such action is thus respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees, or believes for any other reason that direct contact with Applicant's attorney would advance the prosecution of the case to finality, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

WU & CHEUNG, LLP

Dated: June 26, 2006

By: 
Charles C.H. Wu, Esq.
REG. NO. 39,081
Vikram M. Reddy, Esq.
REG. NO. 53,508
Attorneys for Applicant

WU & CHEUNG, L.L.P.
98 DISCOVERY
IRVINE, CALIFORNIA 92618-3105
TEL: 949-251-0111
FAX: 949-251-1588
E-MAIL: CCHWU@WCLAWYERS.COM
USPTO CUSTOMER NO.: 25864